

## **APPENDIX E. Summary of Public Comments**



January 2, 2004

committed to the POWER of clear, concise, creative communication

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

**Written Comments from Comment Forms and Sticky Notes**

**Tee Intersection Alternative:**

- Far preferable to any other and overall very good, but very deficient in keeping Hwy 89 access at existing corner of Lockett/Kasper/Hwy 89. This must be closed and instead create a T style intersection at left traffic signal (the same shown closest to Fanning Dr.). I am concerned that without a firm commitment from the city of Flagstaff to move the mall entrance to align with Cummings Dr. the whole effort is wasted. The problem with traffic backing up onto I-40 is due to the existing close proximity of Railhead and the mall entrance together with the stupid timing of these lights (they always run through all cycles even if unneeded). The backup is NOT caused by merging issues.
- This plan seems to be the most biker and ped. Friendly. We need to plan better to have our trails connect which this one appears to do. Trails need to get you somewhere. With this plan I could bike from home to the mall and downtown! What a concept!!
- We need to encourage the maximum number of bikes and pedestrians to get as many cars off the roads as possible. This plan seems to best accomplish that goal efficiently and safely.
- #1 preference. Be sure to include underpass(es) for bikes/pedestrians. Better drainage.
- Best – the right choice. Keep all signals coordinated for maximum flow levels. Cheapest alternative for business and buildings involved.
- I think the T intersection would be the best for Flagstaff.
- This alternative is completely unworkable. By the time you get 60,000 + cars thru a T intersection (the most at rush hours) it will cause a backup in traffic in 3 directions. Wipes out several businesses Flagstaff cannot afford to lose.
- Seems best by far! For traffic flow and water run off which has been a huge problem in the past. Thanks.
- This is the one – separates industrial traffic and Country Club traffic to 2 intersections – allows greatest potential for future expansion (or seems to).
- Best choice

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

committed to the POWER of clear, concise, creative communication

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

- Less is more!
- I prefer this alternative.
- I like this!
- I support the bike/ped tunnel connection for the FUTS. As a driver I think this also safer.
- Seems cleaner design. ~~What will slope if B-40 down to intersection be? Purina traffic?~~
- Best of the proposal presented.
- This we agree with although it will be more expensive and timely.
- This would be second intersection, but again timing of lights would be most benefit. Raised is also bad idea – more accidents in icy weather.
- This alternative looks very acceptable, three lanes could help the congestion. I think there should a four way stop at Kaspar. This could also help local residents.
- This appears to be best choice. Your diagram refers to underpasses in the plural. There should be more than one underpass under 89A. For example, connecting the FUTS along both sides where 89A will be 7 lanes by Mall Way.
- If it moves more traffic, more efficiently – good. How will this impact the light/intersection at Railhead?
- Don't like lights; Country Club Volumes will compound the timing for 89A
- Truck noise stopping at all the lights
- Traffic light at Cummings is great! Why not connect Kaspar to Linda Vista to alleviate traffic?
- Make a complete, safe, continuous bike path
- This would be the most beneficial of them all. Provides for easy flow, minimal turning options and enhancement of the neighborhood I live in by providing a new green space.

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03.

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

- Poor option since it does not adequately address the overall traffic problems in the vicinity. Does address drainage and pedestrian/bicycle needs, which is good, but probably further aggravates a bad situation with more lights and traffic hold up.
- We have lived in Mobile Haven since 1970. Even when N. Hwy 89 was a 2 lane road, there was never a safe way to go and come to our little part of town. After studying the alternatives, I think "Tee" fits our needs best. It seems to be safest and best way to handle the traffic.
- I like this alternative the best as it is the most uncomplicated of the three. I couldn't attend the open house but I got documents with the illustrations of each alternative (and the pros/cons of each). I cannot fully understand this alternative from your illustration. ~~How does the road get down to the current level of US 89? Will there be left and right turn lanes for Country Club traffic turning north or south on 89? One would assume so but your drawing does not detail intersection traffic flow.~~

**Button Hook Alternative:**

- Not acceptable. Better than Single-Point, but not acceptable. It leaves the dangerous opening at Lockett/Kasper/Hwy 89.
- Preference #2. I prefer the 3 lanes turning left on the N-89 to the 2 lanes offered in this area on the single-point design alternative.
- No – north bound lanes to ice up in winter. Too radical of curves sloping down to a light. Cars backing up and slowing down on curves. Slow traffic flow, especially with an accident occurring at intersections.
- This still runs all of 89 and Country Club traffic thru one stop light. All of Country Club traffic is dumped back into 89 at a stop light.
- Blind approach to intersection is undesirable.
- ~~How is Purina traffic addressed?~~
- Too complicated.
- Do not like.
- Why not eliminate left turns at Cummings to increase efficiency

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

- Consider bike lanes in road (all alternatives)
- Move bike path to South (west) side of B-40 (all alternatives)
- Westbound 66 to eastbound Country Club is not connected for bikes
- Truck noise gearing up and braking down Country Club
- Exit Country Club Drive to Rt 66 for new mall entrance
- Not a good design for a small community. Much better in larger cities but definitely not for Flagstaff.

**Single-Point Urban Intersection Alternative:**

- Not acceptable. I can't believe how confusing this would be for drivers. This would make Enterprise and Butler look like a picnic!
- No – Too massive and evasive for given area. Slow traffic flow.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> best but not good. Too much construction.
- The intersection is more confusing than helpful.
- Too complex. Purina traffic?
- Do not like.
- Fanning/89 is bad; eliminating Lockett makes it worse
- Fanning/89 is a mess; eliminating access to Lockett makes it worse
- Truck noise gearing up and braking down Country Club
- Bicycle system westbound on 66 to eastbound on Country Club discontinuous
- Better flow than any other—do this one!
- Why not put all mall traffic on 66?

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

- Like through movement on 89; no lights!
- Too much complication. Will probably confuse drivers more by having too many turn options.

**No Action Alternative:**

- Not acceptable.
- The congestion is a problem. This is not a viable alternative.
- n/a
- Best action. Country Club traffic flows smoothly west bound without a stop. Hwy 89 flows smoothly without stopping at a Country Club stop light.
- If we take no action now things will only get more expensive when we finally realize it has to be done.
- Out of the question.
- The area needs improvement.
- Please work with City of Flagstaff to include Linda Vista into this project.
- Would like to see – retro fit or replace overpass – time lights for trucks and vehicles. Would be best for icy road conditions.
- Not acceptable for “non-motorized” folks!
- Traffic presently needs to improve – so no action is not acceptable.
- Not acceptable.
- Best! Fewest lights for those coming off and on Country Club. Traffic flows better in all directions needs ped and bike access though.
- Best option until a better plan is developed, which reflects consideration of the overall traffic/social/drainage needs of the area.

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9544 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

committed to the POWER of clear, concise, creative communication.

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

- Not an option in my mind.
- Not working currently and will never work properly for movement of traffic.
- The main advantage of this alternative is that it saves \$20M. Perhaps the money could then be spent on addressing the causes of the problem.

**Other comments:**

- As the world's first international dark sky city, Flagstaff (and Coconino County) have sought to protect our dark nighttime skies from unnecessary light pollution at every level, from citizen activism to some of the nation's most restrictive lighting ordinances.
- Although ADOT is not required to conform its roadway lighting to local ordinances, we urge them to do so. In particular, we request that ADOT employ only low-pressure sodium (LPS) fixtures. The benefit of LPS to Flagstaff's astronomical community is measurable and significant. LPS pollution can to a large extent be mathematically subtracted from astronomical CCD camera imaging, the most common form of image capture among Flagstaff's professional astronomical community. The Flagstaff Dark Skies Coalition wishes to be actively involved in this process at every stage.
- Consider closing Lockett/Rt 66 intersection – may open up north side of “T” or send that traffic to Fanning/Rt 66 or Cummings/89 both of which are signalized.
- Would have like to see sections and elevations of pertinent areas in lack(?) alternative. Visual quality: it isn't too early to show/explore the aesthetic ramifications of each alternative – retaining wall treatments, potential planting areas and treatments, quick rendering of driver's views of the “roadscape,” bicycle path and ped. treatments, etc. ~~Have preliminary costs been done for each alternative that could be shared at this time?~~
- Would have liked more information on enhancement to visual quality with “T” intersection alternative. Also would have liked more detail on potential impacts to historic properties and noise levels.
- Various proposals can not be evaluated without environmental impact studies results. I am more then concerned about noise issues.
- 2 T intersections. 4-way at 1<sup>st</sup> intersection.

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

- Need EIS and NEPA before adequate evaluation. Make sure noise walls and noise reducing road surfaces are a high priority!
- If bike paths have to stop at every intersection, they will ride with traffic instead. Biking isn't just pleasure – it's transportation. Also keep in mind 2 of my bikes are over 7 feet long and I often pull my son in a 31" wide trailer.
- Concern light at Cummings would be too close to all alternatives. Backs up now with mall entrance. I've been sitting on I-40 waiting to get safely even to the off ramps. Dangerous.
- My #1 comment and suggestion is to close the entrance of Lockett on to Hwy 89 and tie it in with the new intersection for old Hwy 66/Hwy 89. Leaving this intersection open provides an opportunity for increase in traffic accidents, by people trying to turn north onto Hwy 89. In addition, it may increase the traffic through the Lynch corridor and neighborhood, (creating hazards to those using the new green space park), by drivers heading to the new light at Cummings and north Hwy 89. I would definitely consider these suggestions as I will continue to bring them up at any and all future meetings.
- All of the action plans are poor because they are made as band-aids, which do not address the overall traffic problems in the I-40/B-40/US 89 area. There was no discussion of an overall long-term plan and how this project fits into it. There was no clear indication that any of the plans would actually improve the traffic flow or safety issues. The meeting should have begun with the discussion of how this project fits into the long-term plan and what constraints were being put on this phase of the long-term plan. Why doesn't the plan consider using an improved E. Industrial Street and E. Industrial/B-40 tie-in to divert some of the traffic flow away from 89/B-40? Where was the discussion of better use of old 66 to alleviate the 89/B-40 congestion and redirect traffic to and through the mall area? This is a half-baked poorly conceived plan and should be redone in a comprehensive manner.
- South Fanning Drive has 2 NB lanes, one is left turn, one is straight or right turn. 90 percent turn right, which backs up when someone wants to go straight. Could a right turn only lane be added? North Fanning Drive backs up north of US 89 and people cut through the parking lots. Is there any way to alleviate the congestion?
- I was dismayed to hear at the meeting that this EA was not addressing the intersections north, south and at I-40. The problems at 89/B-40 are caused by these intersections but nothing is being done to improve them. I have gone to the city meetings on the mall changes. Their plans address mall circulation. The mall developers say ADOT is dealing with the 89 traffic. ADOT says the city/mall developers are dealing with the 89 traffic.

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645





January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

Actually, no one is. You have a major generator (the mall) whose traffic mixes with 1) the heavy industrial traffic (trucks, buses, fire engines) that use Railroad Ave and 2) the thru traffic on 89. The mall developers forecast an additional 25,000 ADT from their expansion. Bandaaid improvements like the 3 alternatives only address present problems (and could actually make the situation worse because the truck traffic from behind the mall isn't dealt with). You also don't deal with the dangerous back-up onto I-40 at the east bound exit. We need another exit past Purina. This will take the 89 thru traffic out of the 89/B-40 X and give the industrial traffic behind the mall access to I-40 without going through the 89/B-40 X.

- My name is James Whitehead. I own the building at 3900 E. Rt. 66. I have no desire to sell my building through condemnation or otherwise. I certainly feel that the Tee Intersection would be the most economical method. I also fee that it would serve the traffic needs quite well. If you would like to speak to me my phone # is 928-699-9173. I didn't know about the meeting and did not attend. I would like to be kept informed of what is happening.

**Comments/Questions following presentation**

- Please elaborate on the seismic deficiency of BNSF bridge. (Answer: new codes)
- Light at Cummings, is that firm? Would mall entrance change? (Answer: current signal to move to Cummings)
- Comment on "T" Alternative: preserves intersection at Lockett and \*(A; provides outlet at Kaspar near Village Inn
- Sections and elevations would be helpful to see
- How will traffic be alleviated with signals proposed? (Answer: traffic operations and projected numbers; traffic model will be run; preliminary analysis has been done)
- Have you looked at re-routing trucks to help congestion? (Answer: will look at traffic movement within the project limits; mall redevelopment will split some traffic; City is doing study as well)
- Concerned about safety at Cummings—no safety zone—accidents; right turn only is not effective; access points on 89A
- "T" Alternative—potential for recreational use in drainage area (Answer: that's correct; make basins into multi-use facilities and tie in to trail system)

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

committed to the POWER of clear, concise, creative communication

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

- Which alternative handles the most traffic volume? (Answer: "T" alternative would because it splits traffic into two separate intersections)
- How can you connect Linda Vista into this project?
- Doesn't see any of the alternatives improving traffic; would you scrap these alternatives if traffic; look further north for the improvements; problems come from traffic signals at the mall
- When is start date for construction? (Answer: July 2005)
- Stack in Phoenix/tunnel—traffic disappears; suggestion to tunnel traffic with park above to help noise (Answer: issues with drainage, cost, soil, ventilation; looking at noise through EA process)
- How is truck acceleration and deceleration accounted for in traffic signal synchronization since it is so different from regular vehicles? (Answer: traffic counts apply a factor to the analysis to account for larger vehicles)
- Length of construction for each of the alternatives? (Answer: complete end 2006 for each)
- When will EA be complete? (Answer: draft August 2004)
- Will there be a signal at Cummings in each alternative? (Answer: yes)

**Letter received from Bob Sellers Toyota on December 4, 2003**

Dear Ms. Darr,

Thank you very much for the informative meeting December 4<sup>th</sup> on the new T intersection in Flagstaff. There are some concerns that I would like to express to you that are also shared with other business people on Kaspar Drive. There is a serious safety problem with the only entrance to Kaspar Drive on Lockett. The traffic pressure is unsafe and next to impossible to make a left hand turn onto Highway 89. It is also difficult to make a right turn off of Highway 89.

It seems logical to us that at the time of construction that the first light past Lockett could dump into Kaspar and become a much safer way on and off of Kaspar. We have had some interest from the County to purchase our property although nothing has transacted. It seems to me that

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

whether or not that happens there is no safe way to arrive on Kaspar for buses, tourist and everyday traffic without using the light.

~~I~~ would appreciate your response to this request and we would hope there is some way to access Kaspar Drive at the intersection.

Respectfully,

Robert G. Sellers.

Cc: Chuck Gillick

**Letter Received from Wertz Tire & Auto Service Inc. on December 15, 2003**

Dear Ms. Darr:

I was unable to attend the December 4<sup>th</sup> meeting on the new T intersection in Flagstaff. However, the content of the discussion has been brought to my attention and I have some concerns.

Over the last 19 years, I have been in business at this location and have seen and continue to see daily traffic problems getting onto Kaspar Drive from Route 66 at Lockett. Vehicles that are east bound on Rt 66 and try to turn onto Lockett or Kaspar, have a difficult time doing so because of the amount of west bound traffic and the speed of that traffic.

With the proposed new T intersection shown on your map, the stoplight would allow traffic from the mall to get back onto Rt 66 (89 N). If you would let that traffic continue on over Rt 66, and flow through onto Kaspar, it should decrease the congestion and other problems created at Lockett, Kaspar, Rt 66 turn off. This would not only alleviate the safety issues at this intersection but would also be advantageous for local businesses.

I applaud you for proposing to raise the level of Rt 66 closer to the level of Kaspar Drive. This should help tremendously with the water drain off problem that I have seen over the years!

~~A~~ response to this suggestion would be appreciated. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Robert C. Wertz



January 2, 2004

committed to the POWER of clear, concise, creative communication

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

**Letter Received from Westcor Partners on December 16, 2003**

To Whom It May Concern:

Westcor is the owner of the Flagstaff Mall (under the ownership entity of "Flagstaff Mall Associates Limited Partnership"). We respectfully submit comments on certain elements of the proposed/planned East Flagstaff T.I. project.

In the public meeting of December 3, 2003, we note all ADOT schematic alternatives eliminate the traffic signal at the current mall Mall entry on Highway 89 and a new entry, with traffic signalization, is planned at Cummings Street. Right-in and right-out turns will continue to be allowed at the current Mall entry off Highway 89. We have agreed to this and continue to support this specific component of the project.

However, we respectfully request that left-in turns be allowed at the current Mall entry location, for south-bound traffic on Highway 89 to enter the Mall.

We will work with ADOT to make sure the queueing (stacking) lane is sufficient to meet all safety requirements.

Our research clearly indicated we need this referenced left-in turn as the modified entries into the Mall will force our shoppers to the ends of the Mall with limited direct access off Highway 89 into the center portion of the Mall. The requested left-in turn, as well as the shown right-in and right-out turns, will greatly assist in a more balanced parking situation on the Mall itself.

Your consideration of this request is appreciated.

Sincerely,  
Mitch Stallard  
Vice-President, Development

MS:cc

c. John Harper  
ADOT

Rodney Bragg  
DMJM Harris

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

**Letter Received from Coconino County Public Works Department on  
December 15, 2003**

Dear Ms. Simpson-Colebank:

I have reviewed the four alternatives presented for the East Flagstaff Interchange and find the Tee Intersection Alternative to be the preferred alternative. The No Action Alternative will not work as traffic now backs up all the way to the I-40 ramps at times, creating safety concerns. Both the Single Point and Button Hook Alternatives create confusion for drivers and do not handle the traffic flow as well as the Tee Intersection Alternative.

Coconino County has over 10,000 residents that live east of this intersection and commute thru it on a daily basis. The current traffic interchange and signal spacing create long delays for these commuters. The projected increases in traffic along with additional development will lengthen these delays. This intersection also serves many tourist on their way to the North Rim of the Grand Canyon and Lake Powell.

The Tee Intersection Alternative will handle the projected traffic with the least amount of delay. This Alternative also meets driver expectancy of the tourist seeking to go north on US 89. Pedestrian and bike traffic will also be able to travel through this area safely. The drainage problems at the current intersection can be addressed much easier with this design.

Please call if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,  
Dale D. Wegner, Jr., P.E.  
County Engineer

cc: John Dobrinski

**Letter Received from Michael Terzich on December 29, 2003**

3868 N. Steves Blvd. Flagstaff, AZ 86004  
774-3402 (work), email: Michael\_Terzich@nps.gov



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

Since I wasn't part of your original scoping to develop alternatives I am a bit late on my comments for that process. However your basic premises or purpose and need are correct but not to the degree at which they are represented.

- The premise of high volumes of nonmotorized travel generated by people going to and from the Mall is not substantiated by any studies as far as I am aware. But there is a need for safe pedestrian and bicycle access through the area that does not exist as a designated path at this time.
- The intersections along US 89 and B-4/Country Club Drive will become congested over time and during current peak use periods. Your brief handout did not mention where this traffic is coming from or headed to. But after talking with your engineer I would agree with him that most of your traffic volume and problem comes from vehicles heading off of I-40 onto US 89 and vice versa as well as continued volume increases on US 89 both north and south.
- Water runoff is a problem all over Flagstaff and could be addressed with any alternative you develop. Retention areas are available within the existing landscape.

**Response to the Alternatives Developed**

**No Action**

This alternative works well in providing traffic flow through the area and especially on to the overpass and off of the overpass traveling south and west. You couldn't have done a better job of this. No traffic lights and merging works well with little safety problems. It also allows traffic to choose between Fanning and Lockett to cross US 89 however the later is consider more dangerous by some. But when Fanning backs up and trains disrupt the lights many local traffic folks use the Lockett crossing as an alternative as well as Kasper to maneuver through the area. This phenomenon allows for alternative routes to relieve congestion during peak times. This same phenomena is shown by how many vehicles now use Cedar and Lockett over the hill to cross town instead of Route 66/US 89 because of the tremendous amount of lights on that route.

The main problem with the No Action Alternative is that it does not move traffic through the two problem lights adjacent to the Mall. This backs up traffic on the overpass and through those lights on Country Club Drive and impedes traffic on US 89 that is through traffic and not local business traffic.

Accommodation for bikes and pedestrians could be added to this alternative without too much trouble with other improvements.

**Single-Point Urban Interchange Alternative**

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

committed to the POWER of clear, concise, creative communication

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

This alternative allows for reasonable accommodation for pedestrians and bicycles however it would be safer to use Kasper as a multi-use path along side the existing roadway. Making the grade up and under the overpass doesn't make sense compared to the Kasper route.

This alternative is what I would call "Let's Park Them Vehicles On the Roadway" Alternative. You've created more capacity by building more lanes to park vehicles out of the traffic light areas and then you've made a congestion point with the new light. This is accentuated by the additional light at the new mall entrance (more impeding traffic flow). Adding traffic lights to any roadway causes additional hazards unless the intersection already exists. Take a look at your statistics on accidents at perpendicular intersections and their severity. You are purposely creating an unsafe situation to relieve congestion. Congestion is safer than two additional intersections impeding traffic. Yes...I do understand the new through overpass...but it wouldn't be needed if you weren't creating the new intersection. Separating the US 89 traffic via a grade is not a solution to the initial problem...it is the solution to the problem that the alternative creates. Solve the initial problem. The mess underneath the raised US 89 will be a traffic light nightmare. Good examples of this can be found at the I-17 Dunlap interchange in Phoenix...you might as well get a motel while waiting for the light to change and you almost need a crossing guard to figure out where to drive after you get the big green.

This alternative eliminates cross traffic on Lockett at US 89 and it appears to eliminate the use of Kasper. These eliminations directly affect vehicle use by those that seek alternative routes around the Fanning intersection problem. This alternative will create more of a congestion problem at the Fanning Intersection causing delays and safety issues due to the impatience with users.

This alternative eliminates businesses in the area and spends money needlessly on right of way costs.

This alternative should state that the Cummings Street light would replace the light to the east otherwise there is no gain. See suggested new alternative.

**Button Hook Alternative**

This alternative does a better job of pedestrian and bike flow (see comments above).

This alternative impedes flow off the overpass on to US 89 going west. It requires all vehicles to be controlled by the traffic light. Same comments as above on the traffic light issue impeding flow of traffic and causing an unsafe situation where it was safe before. Some time in the future there will be deaths due to this new traffic light and the one proposed in the previous alternative.

Once again it parks cars on the roadway instead of relieving congestion and it puts it in a different place than the No Action Alternative.

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

Once again it is spending money on right of way acquisitions that are not necessary and traffic lights that aren't necessary.

Kasper and Lockett seem to be left intake. If so...no comments here...otherwise the same comments as above on impacting local users at the Fanning intersection.

Same comments as above regarding the Cummings Street light.

**Tee Intersection**

This alternative works ok with pedestrian and bike users moving through the area...but this isn't the main problem in this area as mentioned above. I hope you will not overweight this factor because it is the least of the problems you are tackling.

Now you have three new lights. I bet you can guess what my comments are on each of them by now. So just read above for those thoughts.

However the T-Intersection appears to be another parking solution that once again impedes traffic coming off the overpass and onto the overpass. Also the intersection creates a safety problem of cross traffic where there wasn't one before. Once again you have opted to stop everyone when the No Action Alternative only provides discomfort for those folks that are moving north off the overpass on to US 89 heading to Doney Park.

**Potential Impacts of Alternatives**

Each alternative (other than the No Action Alternative) creates safety hazards where the existing condition does not. The creation of new intersections where none exist today does not provide a solution without an additional safety impact to users both in vehicles and on foot or bicycle. Please provide a projected amount of additional accidents intersections create over straight roadway and their severity. Roundabouts should be thoroughly investigated if any of these intersections are proposed as the preferred alternative. Although your engineers have stated that roundabouts can not handle the projected traffic volume...handling it by parking vehicles on roadway and at traffic lights is not handling it either. This could be your chance to model a traffic solution that could be used in other parts of the city and state. This town needs it badly. Many of us have had to choose where to live in Flagstaff due to the problems with US 66 congestion and poor traffic flow management. The new solution at Enterprise parks cars wonderfully and still impedes the flow through the area.

The high cost of right of way acquisition should be considered for each alternative and the attributes weighed against the cost. As far as I can determined the alternatives don't relieve congestion except at specific traffic lights that could back up on the overpass.

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645





January 2, 2004

committed to the POWER of clear, concise, creative communication

## **East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

### **Summary of Public Comment**

Each alternative should evaluate the efficiency or waste of fuel and impedance of flow for vehicles using the system. I don't think Executive Orders via the Federal Highways Administration supports inefficient infrastructure that continues to increase our use of the nation's fuel resources.

#### **Free Flow Alternative: The Doney Park Skyway**

Ok...I'm not going to criticize your alternatives without offering a solution to the problem of congestion at this interchange. The main problem you have is congestion and traffic flow and the existing situation generally does a good job of keeping us all moving through the area except when the peak hits. That peak backs up vehicles on the overpass that want to head toward Page and Doney Park but rarely creates any other problems except at the Mall Lights (the terrible two).

This alternative proposed to create a new ramp leading off the overpass just north of the existing exit ramp to Page. The ramp however would stay elevated and proceed northeast above the median of US 89 passing above the terrible two lights at the Mall and then gradually meet the existing roadway pass the Safeway driveway...merging with local US 89 traffic in the left lane. The skyway would be wide enough for one lane of traffic and an emergency lane and would be signed at its beginning as a bypass. Users wanting to go to the Mall or other businesses in the area would use the existing ramp and roadways. People keep moving where they want to go...businesses still have access...no right of way acquisitions and you have relieved congestion on the existing ramp as well as at the terrible two traffic lights. The new Mall entrance isn't needed either. You could match this elevated skyway with one heading west on US 89 and connecting with the overpass but I don't think this has a big demand because you have plenty of "parking" east of the terrible two traffic lights in the west bound lanes.

This alternative would still need drainage solutions and pedestrian/bicycle routes already shown in the other alternatives.

This alternative does interject a new impact into the mix...visual. Flagstaff is now used to massive interchanges after the new I-17/I-40 work was completed. And a new overhead Skyway would be a tough sell and may cost you more than in the current budget...but it provides a solution that looks to the future of safe traffic in the area and adds capacity flow and not parking spaces on the roadway.

Mixing this alternative with the No Action alternative and a multi-use path you will be meeting your purpose and need more efficiently than the other alternatives. At present your existing alternatives do not provide a sufficient range of solutions that meet the purpose and need.

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

committed to the POWER of clear, concise, creative communication

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

I know you've worked hard on this problem and I applaud your efforts. Let's take it to the next step and provide a solution that will work for future highway flyers as well as local residents. After all...shouldn't those Doney Park residents have an expresslane through the local congestion so that they don't contribute to the problem in the area? This could also relieve traffic on Route 66 if vehicles had a way to get through that mess at the Mall by using I-40 and the Doney Park Skyway!

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Please call me if you'd like to discuss this further. Also please see that the head of Engineering for ADOT in Flagstaff receives this comment via e-mail.

Thank you,  
Michael Terzich

**Letter Received from Brent and JoAnne Archinal on December 31, 2003**

Dear Sir or Madam:

I realize I am writing past the deadline of December 17, but I would like to comment regarding the East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange, following the open house of December 3. I can understand if it is too late to consider these comments, but if it is at all possible that they can in full or in part then I hope they prove useful.

I follow the format here of your comment form.

**Tee Intersection Alternative:**

It appears to me from the presentation made and further details presented that this alternative will provide for the greatest traffic flow (e.g. number of vehicles/hour) of any of the alternatives. This seems to me to be the most important factor in deciding which of the alternatives should be used. I personally dread the prospect of having to sit through what may be a few long light cycles every time I pass through this area once the changes are made. However, that would be preferable to traffic jams resulting from using other alternatives that allow for less traffic.

**Button Hook Alternative:**

This alternative appears to be unacceptable to me due to the complexity and size of the single intersection, which it would seem to me, is just asking for all sorts of safety problems. It also seems the left turn traffic going onto US 89 north would be very heavy during every cycle of the light at the intersection, which in turn would substantially slow down traffic going in all other directions.

**Single-Point Urban Intersection Alternative:**

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

In general appearance, this alternative seems favorable since traffic will continue to be separated by an actual interchange. Unfortunately, it appears from the presentation and other material that this alternative will not handle much more traffic than the current situation, and there are still safety problems due to traffic weaving on and off the access ramps.

**No Action Alternative:**

I believe there is something to be said for "doing nothing" as this alternative implies, if traffic flow capacity is not otherwise substantially increased. And currently it appears that most - if not all - of the other alternatives do not substantially increase capacity, if only because no new additional lanes are really being added.

In addition, during the presentations it was pointed out that the mall entrance could be moved. If this is the case, why not close it now entirely, and move the main mall entrance to Railhead Avenue? This would eliminate both much of the safety problems in traffic weaving on and off the right lane on 89 north approaching the current entrance, and one of the traffic lights on 89 could be eliminated. There might easily, given these changes, be no need for further changes at the interchange for several years.

A further suggestion would be - for whoever is in charge, ADOT or the City of Flagstaff - to finally get around to timing the existing lights properly along this stretch of US 89. As far as I can determine, except for the 2 lights at Railhead and the Mall entrance, none of the traffic lights along this stretch of highway are connected to the others, thus greatly and continuously slowing down traffic. I had been told by an ADOT representative several years ago that one of the reasons for installing new streetlights on this section of 89 was so that the traffic lights could also be wired together and timed properly. Well, the street lights are now there. When are the traffic lights going to be timed?

A further question is why the left turn lights in this area are always part of the light cycle, even when no cars are present in the left turn lanes? I understand the concept that the pavement sensors may not be working and the left turn lights should allow for turns occasionally in case a vehicle is present and has not been detected - but is this necessary on every single cycle?! I would think that fixing this problem alone would conservatively allow 10-20% more traffic through, at least at non-peak times when the left turn lanes are not much in use.

So in short, I think a lot could be done right now, at low cost, to speed up traffic and increase safety in this area, with little to no road construction at all.

**Additional comments / suggestions:**

---

Blue text are comments entered after initial summary sent on 12/12/03 and orange after 12/19/03

KRISTIN DARR & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108 • Phoenix, AZ 85028  
602-368-9644 • Fax 602-368-9645



January 2, 2004

**East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange Project  
December 3, 2003 Public Open House**

**Summary of Public Comment**

1. Regarding the overall issue of which alternative should be chosen, I believe the key factor is which alternative will allow for the best flow of traffic and (in general) the safest flow of traffic. Before the presentations I had believed that this could best be done by the use of a full interchange at this location. However, if sufficient space is not available or planned for a full interchange, including additional traffic lanes, then it does appear that some "simple" intersection (i.e. the single-point interchange alternative) may be best for increased traffic flow.

2. Another factor regarding safety in this area that was not brought up at the presentation or in the handout material was the type of street lighting planned for this area. It is not clear to me that the new street lighting just to the north on US 89 was really needed, but given that it was installed, ADOT has done an excellent job of putting in low-glare, full cutoff, low pressure sodium lighting. If construction is done at the interchange and lighting replaced or new lighting added, it should be of a similar high quality, i.e. low glare in particular.

ADOT must avoid putting in high-mast lighting such as that at the I-17 and I-40 interchange. Compared to other places in Arizona and certainly compared to other places in the U.S., the high-mast lighting there is reasonable since it is at least full cutoff lighting. But it is currently the worst highway lighting in northern Arizona and completely out of character given the rural quality of northern Arizona, and the need to preserve dark skies and local observatories. From a more practical point of view, due to the high-mast concept, the glare from this lighting is terrible, and it would not be surprising to see it contributing more to traffic accidents in this area as opposed to increasing safety.

In summary on this point, ADOT is one of the most forward looking organizations in the U.S. when it comes to installing reasonable roadway lighting. But improvements are still needed in many existing ADOT installations, and any new lighting at this interchange should be installed correctly as low-glare lighting, without the use of high-mast lighting.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the interchange alternatives. I hope these comments may prove useful.

Regards,  
B. Archinal



Arizona Department of Transportation  
Intermodal Transportation Division  
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano  
Governor

Victor M. Mendez  
Director

January 27, 2004

Bill Higgins  
State Engineer

Brent and JoAnne Archinal  
Email: starr\_nt@email.msn.com

Re: East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange  
Flagstaff, Arizona

Dear Brent and JoAnne:

Thank you for your email dated December 31, 2003 regarding the East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange located at the junction of Business Route 40 (Country Club Drive) and U.S. Highway 89 (US 89) in Flagstaff, Arizona. Your comments regarding the proposed alternatives will be taken into consideration as we move forward with this project.

This project will install new roadway lighting that will meet the City's requirements for light pollution reduction such as low-pressure sodium lighting. This project will not include any high mast lighting.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this project and we look forward to your continued involvement.

Sincerely,

Bahram Dariush  
ADOT Project Manager

Cc: John Harper, ADOT  
Justin White, ADOT  
Tiffin Miller, City of Flagstaff  
Paul Waing, DMJM+HARRIS  
Rodney Bragg, DMJM+HARRIS  
Ralph Ellis, LSD  
Marsha Miller, KDA





## Arizona Department of Transportation Intermodal Transportation Division

206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano  
Governor

Victor M. Mendez  
Director

May 24, 2004

Debra Brisk  
Deputy Director

Mr. Michael Terzich  
3868 N. Steves Blvd.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Re: East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange  
Flagstaff, Arizona

Mr. Terzich:

Thank you for your e-mail (dated April 20, 2004) regarding the East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange located at the junction of Business Route 40 (Country Club Drive) and U.S. Highway 89 (US 89) in Flagstaff, Arizona. Your e-mail indicates that the current congestion problems on US 89 are not caused by the existing interchange, but rather the existing traffic signals along US 89 near the Flagstaff Mall.

When the original roadways were built, access control rights were not purchased and therefore driveways were allowed by permit. In order to provide access to the adjacent developments and from local streets, traffic signals were installed along US 89/Route 66 at Fanning Drive, Railhead Avenue, and the Flagstaff Mall entrance. By the 1990's, the B-40/US 89 traffic interchange had traffic signals within roughly 1,000 feet of each free-flow ramp.

When the B-40/US 89 interchange was originally constructed, all three legs of the interchange were free-flow. Currently, all three legs of the interchange have traffic signals within close proximity to the ramps. According to the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2000), the operational effects of merging and diverging vehicles is the highest within 1,500 feet of the ramps. According to the Transportation Research Board's *Access Management Manual* (2003), adequate spacing and design of access locations in the vicinity of ramps avoids traffic backups and preserves safe and efficient traffic operation in the vicinity of the ramp terminals. In a fully developed urban area, the *Access Management Manual* recommends a minimum of 750 feet between the entrance ramp and the first right-in, right-out driveway; a minimum of 2,640 feet to the first major four-legged intersection; and a minimum of 990 feet to the first fully directional median opening. In addition, the *Access Management Manual* states that free-flow ramps are generally discouraged in urban areas because pedestrian and bicycle movements are difficult and potentially dangerous. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) publish the *Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets* ("Green Book"). The 2001 "Green Book" discusses the importance of access control near traffic interchanges and concludes that access control is essential to preserve the intended function of the interchange. It also states that operational problems are caused by the signalization of the adjacent access locations.



The existing conditions do not meet the recommendations contained in these standard design guidelines. This type of free-flow ramp interchange is typically provided at freeway-to-freeway interchanges where each leg is an access-controlled facility. Neither ADOT nor the City of Flagstaff intends to purchase access rights along US 89 and eliminate the existing traffic signals.

In order to evaluate and address the issues with the current B-40/US 89 interchange, ADOT initiated a Design Concept Report (DCR) in 1999. The DCR process evaluated numerous options over a three-year period. During the initial stages of the Environmental Assessment process, the Tee Intersection Alternative was developed. The project team (ADOT, City of Flagstaff, Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, Coconino County, and Federal Highway Administration) determined that the three action alternatives presented at the public meeting in December 2003 were viable alternatives that meet the goals of the project and should be evaluated in the EA process along with the No Action Alternative.

Your e-mail and previous letter indicate that the proposed action alternatives (Single-Point Urban Interchange, Button Hook, and Tee Intersection) have common flaws: the installation of traffic signals; the cost of additional right-of-way; and that they do not accommodate the heavy traffic flows to and from the northeast along US 89. Your e-mail and previous letter also indicate that the proposed Skyway Alternative would provide significant benefits in these areas compared to the three other action alternatives. As described in your previous letter, the Skyway Alternative would require a second connection from B-40 to northbound US 89. This connection would include a new ramp that would connect to B-40 just north of the existing exit ramp. The new ramp would cross over US 89 and continue northeast along US 89, elevated above the two existing signals and then connect to the median of the existing northbound US 89.

In order to pass over US 89 and the existing signals, the Skyway Alternative would require the construction of a new bridge. The existing US 89 median is not wide enough to accommodate bridge piers. Therefore, improvements to US 89 would be required to allow bridge piers to be constructed within the median. The widening of the US 89 median to accommodate bridge piers would have right-of-way impacts. All properties along US 89 from roughly Lynch Avenue to north of Railhead Avenue would be impacted. In addition, the construction of numerous bridge piers within the median would introduce sight-distance restrictions, especially at the intersections.

As described above, the Skyway Alternative would require a new exit ramp adjacent to the existing ramp that connects B-40 to northbound US 89. The 2001 "Green Book" recommends a minimum of 800 feet between successive ramp terminals for exit-exit configurations. This distance allows for adequate signing and pavement marking in order to provide guidance to motorists. The Skyway Alternative would not provide this separation between successive exit ramps.

The Skyway Alternative would require a new ramp that would connect to the median of northbound US 89 near the existing Safeway driveway north of Railhead Avenue. Currently, the developments adjacent to US 89 (north of Railhead Avenue) have driveways providing access to US 89. The addition of a new ramp into the median of US 89 north of Railhead Avenue would not meet the recommendations described above for access control near ramp terminals, and would create similar weaving and merging issues that currently exist at the ramps on US 89.

As proposed, the Skyway Alternative would provide benefits to the travelers destined for northbound US 89 that would like to bypass the congestion between Cummings Street and Railhead Avenue. However, it would have significant right-of-way impacts; would introduce bridge piers and sight distance obstructions into the US 89 median; would violate geometric and access control guidelines; would not solve the issues identified at the US 89/B-40 interchange; and would only provide benefits to a limited number of travelers by serving only one traffic movement.



We are following the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process in evaluating a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed action, including the "No Action" alternative. Reasonable alternatives are those that may be feasibly carried out based on technical, economic, environmental, and other factors. The Environmental Assessment will document the reasons for eliminating alternatives from detailed study that were suggested by interested agencies or the public during the scoping process. Based on our evaluation of the proposed Skyway Alternative, we find that this concept does not meet the goals of this project.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this project. If you have further questions, please contact us.

Sincerely,



Bahram Dariush, P.E.  
ADOT Project Manager  
205 S. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, MD 614E  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
Phone 602-712-8427

Cc: John Harper, ADOT  
Justin White, ADOT  
Tiffin Miller, City of Flagstaff  
Paul Waung, DMJM+HARRIS  
Ralph Ellis, LSD  
Marsha Miller, KDA







**Arizona Department of Transportation**  
**Intermodal Transportation Division**

206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano  
Governor

Victor M. Mendez  
Director

January 27, 2004

Bill Higgins  
State Engineer

Mr. Robert Wertz  
Wertz Tire and Auto Service  
3735 N. Kaspar  
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Re: East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange  
Flagstaff, Arizona

Mr. Sellers:

Thank you for your letter regarding the East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange located at the junction of Business Route 40 (Country Club Drive) and U.S. Highway 89 (US 89) in Flagstaff, Arizona. As noted in your letter, the above referenced project as the current preferred alternative will construct a new intersection to connect US 89 and U.S. Highway 66 (US 66) that will be located approximately 1,200 feet northeast of the existing Lockett Road intersection.

Your letter noted your traffic operations and safety concerns regarding the existing Lockett Road/Kaspar Avenue intersection with US 89. Your letter also suggested a new connection between Kaspar Avenue and the new US 89/US 66 intersection referenced above. The City of Flagstaff is in the process of evaluating local traffic circulation issues including this potential new connection between Kaspar Avenue and US 89. This connection would be supported, funded, and maintained by the City of Flagstaff.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this project and we look forward to your continued involvement.

Sincerely,

Bahram Dariush, P.E.  
ADOT Project Manager

Cc: John Harper, ADOT  
Justin White, ADOT  
Tiffin Miller, City of Flagstaff  
Paul Waung, DMJM+HARRIS  
Rodney Bragg, DMJM+HARRIS  
Ralph Ellis, LSD  
Marsha Miller, KDA



2001 Award Recipient



**Arizona Department of Transportation**  
**Intermodal Transportation Division**

206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano  
Governor

Victor M. Mendez  
Director

Bill Higgins  
State Engineer

January 29, 2004

Mr. Michael Terzich  
3868 N. Steves Blvd.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Re: East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange  
Flagstaff, Arizona

Mr. Terzich:

Thank you for your email dated December 29, 2003 regarding the East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange located at the junction of Business Route 40 (Country Club Drive) and U.S. Highway 89 (US 89) in Flagstaff, Arizona. The original traffic interchange was built in the late 1960's with free-flow ramps that connected Business Route 40 (B-40) between Interstate 40 (I-40) and US 89. Free-flow loop ramps were provided at both the I-40 interchange and at the US 89 interchange. During the 1980's, development within the area grew and produced the need to provide convenient access to I-40 from all directions. In two separate projects, one in the late 1970's and one in 1990, the I-40 interchange was reconstructed into a diamond interchange, thus creating the Country Club Drive traffic interchange at I-40.

During this same time period, development within the City of Flagstaff encroached into the area adjacent to the B-40/US 89 interchange. In order to provide access to these developments and from local streets, traffic signals were installed along US 89/Route 66. When the B-40/US 89 interchange was originally constructed, all three legs of the interchange were free-flow. Currently, all three legs of the interchange have traffic signals within close proximity to the ramps. Ideally, traffic signals would not be located within the influence area of the ramps.

In general, B-40 (Country Club Drive) and US 89/Route 66 have become urban city streets due to the development and associated driveways and signals. In order to evaluate and address the issues with the current B-40/US 89 interchange, ADOT initiated a Design Concept Report (DCR) in 1999. The DCR process evaluated numerous options over a three year period. The proposed action alternatives offer solutions to the existing and future traffic demands, pedestrian access, and drainage issues.

Your letter suggested a Skyway alternative would provide significant benefits compared to the three other action alternatives. We appreciate your suggestion and will have our design team evaluate this concept further. From a cursory review, adding a new ramp adjacent to the existing ramp would pose significant challenges to comply with all design criteria for construction of successive ramps. In addition, the US 89 median would need to be Widened to accommodate bridge piers for the new ramp. Right-of-way will be impacted on both sides of US 89 for the length of the ramp due to the widening to accommodate the piers.



Thank you for your interest and participation in this project and we look forward to your continued involvement.

Sincerely,

*Bahram Dariush*

Bahram Dariush, P.E.  
ADOT Project Manager

Cc: John Harper, ADOT  
Justin White, ADOT  
Ron Spinar, City of Flagstaff  
Paul Waung, DMJM+HARRIS  
Rodney Bragg, DMJM+HARRIS  
Ralph Ellis, LSD  
Marsha Miller, KDA



**Arizona Department of Transportation**  
**Intermodal Transportation Division**

206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano  
Governor

Victor M. Mendez  
Director

Bill Higgins  
State Engineer

January 27, 2004

Mr. Mitch Stallard  
Vice President, Development  
Westcor  
7260 E. Rocky Ridge Drive  
Tucson, AZ 85750

Re: East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange  
Flagstaff, Arizona

Mr. Stallard:

Thank you for your letter dated December 16, 2003 regarding the East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange located at the junction of Business Route 40 (Country Club Drive) and U.S. Highway 89 (US 89) in Flagstaff, Arizona. As noted in your letter, the above referenced project will remove the existing signal at the current Flagstaff Mall entrance on US 89 located approximately midway between Cummings Street and Railhead Avenue. A new traffic signal will be constructed at the intersection of US 89 and Cummings Street. Minor improvements will be constructed on Cummings Street. This project will not construct a fourth leg at the Cummings Street intersection to facilitate a new Mall entrance. Construction of the new Mall entrance will need to be included with the planned improvements to your development. Right-turn movements will still be allowed for ingress and egress at the current Mall entrance.

The current plan is to eliminate all egress left-turn movements and the southbound left-turn movement from US 89 at the existing Mall entrance. Your request to allow southbound left-turn movements from US 89 into the existing Mall entrance will be evaluated by our design consultant, ADOT, and the City of Flagstaff. Our primary concerns are to maintain traffic flow, operations and safety along US 89.

Thank you for your participation in this project and we will notify you when we have completed our evaluation of your request.

Sincerely,

Bahram Dariush, P.E.  
ADOT Project Manager





**Arizona Department of Transportation**  
**Intermodal Transportation Division**

206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano  
Governor

Victor M. Mendez  
Director

Bill Higgins  
State Engineer

January 29, 2004

Mr. Robert Sellers  
Bob Sellers Toyota  
3773 E. Kaspar Dr.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86003-3270

Re: East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange  
Flagstaff, Arizona

Mr. Sellers:

Thank you for your letter dated December 4, 2003 regarding the East Flagstaff Traffic Interchange located at the junction of Business Route 40 (Country Club Drive) and U.S. Highway 89 (US 89) in Flagstaff, Arizona. As noted in your letter, the above referenced project as the current preferred alternative will construct a new intersection to connect US 89 and U.S. Highway 66 (US 66) that will be located approximately 1,200 feet northeast of the existing Lockett Road intersection.

Your letter noted your traffic operations and safety concerns regarding the existing Lockett Road/Kaspar Avenue intersection with US 89. Your letter also suggested a new connection between Kaspar Avenue and the new US 89/US 66 intersection referenced above. The City of Flagstaff is in the process of evaluating local traffic circulation issues including this potential new connection between Kaspar Avenue and US 89. This connection would be supported, funded, and maintained by the City of Flagstaff.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this project and we look forward to your continued involvement.

Sincerely,

Bahram Dariush, P.E.  
ADOT Project Manager

Cc: John Harper, ADOT  
Justin White, ADOT  
Tiffin Miller, City of Flagstaff  
Paul Waung, DMJM+HARRIS  
Rodney Bragg, DMJM+HARRIS  
Ralph Ellis, LSD  
Marsha Miller, KDA

